

¹ Postscript figure is found at XXX.

Hunds Rule Theory for Heavy Fermion Superconductors

M. R. Norman

*Materials Science Division
Argonne National Laboratory
Argonne, IL 60439*

In this paper, a generalization of standard spin fluctuation theory is considered which takes into account orbital degeneracy effects which are critical for describing f electrons. This theory leads to an instability for a superconducting pair state which obeys Hunds rules. Such a state has $L=5$, $S=1$, and $J=4$. The degeneracy of this state is broken by crystalline effects, and realistic calculations for UPt_3 find a resultant pair state with Γ_6^- symmetry, consistent with current experimental constraints.

PACS numbers: 74.20.-z, 74.70.Tx

From the beginning of theoretical work on heavy fermion superconductors, it has been realized that there are strong connections between these metals and superfluid ^3He .¹ This has led many theorists, including the author, to apply standard spin fluctuation theories which were developed for ^3He to the heavy fermion problem. So far, the results have been mixed. On the plus side, such theories give non s-wave pairing states, and the evidence in most cases is that the heavy fermion superconductors are non s-wave. On the minus side, the actual group representation these theories predict for UPt_3 , the best studied of the heavy fermion superconductors, has so far not matched what we think the experimental data are telling us. Available data point to the pair state having Γ_6^- (E_{2u}) symmetry.² This state is an odd parity two dimensional group representation with line and point nodes, and invariably is suppressed in the spin fluctuation calculations.³ There are further qualitative problems with these theories. In Table 1, a list of the seven known heavy fermion superconductors is shown. There are two obvious facts about this table. Six of the seven superconductors are uranium alloys. Second, all of the superconductors either have two formula units per cell, a point first remarked on by Anderson,⁴ or have a magnetic/structural phase transition at a temperature above T_c so that there are two formula units per cell. Another interesting point is that the magnetic susceptibilities of the two heavy fermion superconductors UPt_3 and UPd_2Al_3 look almost identical to that of PrNi_5 , a localized f^2 system. Moreover, the magnetic susceptibility observed in URu_2Si_2 can be easily explained by an f^2 configuration. The above facts suggest that some on-site interaction is playing a fundamental role in heavy fermion superconductivity, since such an interaction could (1) differentiate between Ce and U ions and (2) depend on having two formula units per cell due to having in phase or out of phase relations between the order parameters on the two sites.⁴ Standard antiferromagnetic spin fluctuation models, based as they are on having an attractive interaction between near neighbor sites, do not directly address these points.

The above issues indicate a need to go back and look more closely at the actual connection between the heavy fermion and 3He cases. The effective potential of two bare f electrons on a uranium site looks very similar to the direct interaction potential for 3He . In particular, the potential is strongly repulsive at short distances due to the direct Coulomb interaction, is attractive at intermediate distances (of order 3 a.u.) due to the uranium ion core, and decays to zero at large distances due to the exponential decay of the f electron wavefunction. The ground state of this potential is well known to have a symmetry of 3H_4 (S=1, L=5, J=4) as this state minimizes the Coulomb repulsion. This represents a qualitative difference between this case and that of 3He . In the latter case, one has maximal S also, but as there is no orbital dependence to the bare interaction, the L state is fixed by the Landau parameters which are difficult to calculate. In the current case, though, the orbital dependence of the interaction automatically fixes the L state, with the J state being fixed by the strong spin-orbit interaction.

To understand this problem further, it is useful to review the multiplet structure for an f^2 ion. The energy terms for the multiplets are best expressed using Racah parameters (LS scheme). Every configuration has an energy E_0 which represents the Coulomb repulsion U (E_0 is equal to the $L = 0$ Coulomb multipole integral F^0 plus a combination of F^2 , F^4 , and F^6 terms). The splitting between singlet and triplet spin states is controlled by the parameter E_1 (a combination of F^2 , F^4 , and F^6 terms), with the 3 triplets having a coefficient of 0 and 3 of the 4 singlets have a coefficient of 2 (the singlet 1S_0 is the highest energy state with a coefficient of 9). Note the similarity to the paramagnon model for 3He where the coefficients are the same (0 and 2), but with the important difference that the splitting in the current case is not determined by the F^0 (charge fluctuation) term as in the single orbital Hubbard model used for 3He but by the $L > 0$ (shape fluctuation) terms. Moreover, the degeneracy of the 3 triplets is lifted by an orbital splitting term, E_3 , which is another combination of $L > 0$ terms. The lowest energy state is 3H with an

energy $E_0 - 9E_3$ with the next highest state being 3F with an energy E_0 . The 3F energy thus represents the energy of two uncorrelated f electrons and thus sets the zero of energy (analogous to the 3He problem, where the energy of the triplet sets the zero of energy).⁵ Unlike the 3He paramagnon problem, the 3H state has an energy lower than the energy zero, i.e., the interaction is already attractive at the bare interaction level. This is only true for a uranium (f^2) ion; for a cerium ion, the zero of energy is set by the energy of the f^1 configuration, and thus the bare interaction is repulsive for all f^2 states. The bare binding energy is equal to the excitation energy from the 3H_4 ground state to the 3F_2 state. This transition has actually been seen in UPt_3 by high energy neutron scattering⁶ and has an energy of 0.373 eV.

It is a non-trivial problem to take this bare binding energy and convert it into an effective binding energy to use between two f electron quasiparticle states at the Fermi surface. To do so, collective effects must be included. First, one takes the bare interaction vertex to be the antisymmetrized Coulomb interaction (direct minus exchange term). For the s electron case, one can easily show that doing a diagram sum using this bare vertex leads to the standard paramagnon results.⁷ The f electron case is more complicated due to the presence of 4 interaction parameters (E_0, E_1, E_2, E_3) and 14 orbitals. If one only keeps the E_0 term, the diagram series can be analytically summed. The result is $E_0/(1 - E_0\chi_0)/(1 + 13E_0\chi_0) + E_0^2\chi_0/(1 - E_0\chi_0)$. This has some important implications, in that the effective repulsion is reduced compared to the bare E_0 as long as χ_0 is not too close to being equal to $1/E_0$ (note the difference again to the s electron case, where the bare repulsion is always reduced in the density channel⁷). One can speculate that the divergence for $\chi_0 = 1/E_0$ represents a localization instability. If one keeps only the E_1 term, the diagram series can also be summed. For the triplet states, one obtains $-11E_1^2\chi_0/(1 - 81E_1^2\chi_0^2)/(1 - 4E_1^2\chi_0^2) + 2E_1^2\chi_0/(1 - 4E_1^2\chi_0^2)$ which has some similarities to the s electron case. In particular, there is an induced attraction for the triplet states.

Note the divergence for $9E_1\chi_0 = 1$ which plays the role of a magnetic instability. The analogous series has also been done for the 1I state, where the induced interaction is $(4E_1 + 13E_1^2\chi_0 - 126E_1^3\chi_0^2 - 162E_1^4\chi_0^3)/(1 - 81E_1^2\chi_0^2)/(1 - 4E_1^2\chi_0^2) - 2E_1$. This also has similarities to the s electron case, and one finds for singlet states an increased repulsion. An analytic expression for the general series has not been obtained due to the complicated coefficients associated with the E_2 and E_3 terms. Instead, one can reduce the vertex equations to a matrix equation which can be solved on a computer. This has been done for the 3H , 3F , 3P , and 1I states. Complete orbital degeneracy has been assumed and no spin-orbit effects have been included.⁸

The results are summarized in Figure 1, where the various effective interactions are plotted versus χ_0 along with the zero of energy for the f^1 case (0) and f^2 case (E_0). The values of E_i were gotten from Goldschmidt⁹ (these values give an F^0 term of 1.83 eV, consistent with spectroscopic data in heavy fermion uranium compounds). As one can see, the triplets become increasingly attractive and the singlet increasingly repulsive as χ_0 increases with a divergence for $(E_0 + 9E_1)\chi_0 = 1$. χ_0 is difficult to estimate since spin-orbit and anisotropy effects play a major role.¹⁰ For illustrative purposes, we assume a "Stoner" renormalization of 4 as seen in 3He . For this value of χ_0 (0.137), the 3H energy is -2.3 eV relative to the f^2 zero of energy. Even for the f^1 case, there is still an (induced) instability for 3H , so that pairing is indeed possible for cerium ions, although less likely.¹¹

One can now estimate the effective pairing matrix element by realizing that the quasiparticle renormalization in the heavy fermion case is mostly frequency dependent in nature.¹² This would then act to renormalize the induced interaction discussed above by a factor of Z^2 since each of the four external lines in the vertex is renormalized by $Z^{1/2}$ (only Z of the bare f electron is in the quasiparticle pole). Z^{-1} is equal to the mass renormalization factor, known from deHaas-vanAlphen measurements to be about 16 in UPt_3 .¹³ This renormalizes the 3H matrix element of 2.3 eV to about 100 K.¹⁴ This value will be further

reduced when projecting onto pair states at the Fermi energy which have the symmetry of a particular group representation. Below, this projection factor is shown to be about $1/8$, so the final value is 12.5 K. Since the renormalized (quasiparticle) Fermi energy, E_F , is about 60 K in UPt_3 (specific heat γ , neutron scattering linewidth), the pairing coupling constant, NV_4Z^2 , is about 0.21 (where N is the renormalized density of states and V_4 is the interaction potential in the 3H_4 channel). With a cut-off of order E_F , this gives a BCS estimate for T_c of 0.6 K. The agreement with experiment is somewhat fortuitous, of course, but the point is that the effective coupling constant is at least of the right order of magnitude.

The actual symmetry of the gap is found by constructing the quasiparticle pair state $|k, -k\rangle$ using relativistic band structure wavefunctions and projecting this onto $J=4$ (this is a specific example of a general procedure advocated in the past¹⁵). The degeneracy of the $J=4$ state is broken due to lattice effects which should be well described by the momentum dependence of the band structure wavefunctions (although these wavefunctions fail to describe the frequency dependence of the quasiparticle states, they give a Fermi surface shape in good agreement with experimental data, indicating that their momentum dependence is reliable). For hexagonal UPt_3 , the 18 fold degeneracy of $J=4$ in the isotropic case ($2J+1$ times the number of f sites in the unit cell, which is two) will be broken into 3 singlets (Γ_1 , Γ_3 , and Γ_4) and 3 doublets (two Γ_5 , one Γ_6), with each representation occurring twice (+ (even parity) representations have the two atoms in phase, and - (odd) have the two atoms out of phase). In Table 2, these states are given in terms of pairs of single particle $J=5/2$ f states. The group transformation properties of these states are listed in Appel and Hertel.¹⁵

For each k point, there are four degenerate states available to construct $|k, -k\rangle$ from.¹⁶ The singlet (even parity) combination is $(|k, Tk\rangle - |PTk, Pk\rangle)/2$ (denoted d_0) and the triplet (odd parity) combinations are $|k, Pk\rangle - (-d_x + id_y)$, $|PTk, Tk\rangle - (d_x + id_y)$, and

$(|k, Tk > + |PTk, Pk >)/2$ (d_z), where P is the parity operator, and T the time reversal one. The odd parity combinations define a "d" vector which lives in a pseudo-spin space.

The resulting pairing matrix element for this model is then

$$\langle k', -k' | H_{eff} | k, -k \rangle_P = (V_4 Z^2) A_{k'}^{*\Gamma\nu j'} A_k^{\Gamma\nu j} \quad (1)$$

where P represents the projection with $A_k^{\Gamma\nu j}$ being the coefficient of the expansion of $|k, -k >$ which has J=4 with the symmetry of the group representation Γ and basis ν (for a two-dimensional representation), and j is the index of the d vector (0 for even, x,y,z for odd). Since the matrix element is separable in k and k', it is trivial to write down the appropriate BCS coupling constant

$$\lambda = (NV_4 Z^2) \sum_j \langle |A_k^{\Gamma\nu j}|^2 \rangle_k \quad (2)$$

where N is the density of states, $\langle \rangle_k$ is an average over a narrow energy shell about the Fermi energy, and j runs over 0 for the even parity case and x,y,z for the odd parity case.

The J=5/2 part of the band structure wavefunctions can be written as $|k > = \sum a_{\mu i}^{nk} |\mu >_i$ where μ runs from -5/2 to 5/2, i is the site index (1,2), and n is the band index (band calculations predict that five f bands contribute to the Fermi surface of UPt_3 ; such a surface is in good agreement with deHaas-vanAlphen data¹³). Thus, the A coefficients can be written as $\sum a_{\mu i}^{nk} a_{\nu i'}^{n-k}$ with k denoting either k or PTk and -k denoting Pk or Tk, with the appropriate linear combinations being those which match the basis states in Table 2 and have the correct parity form (d_0 for even and d_x, d_y, d_z for odd). The average in Eq. (2) was done by constructing a regular grid of 561 k points in the irreducible wedge (1/24) of the Brillouin zone and keeping those nk states which are within 1 mRy of the Fermi energy (182 nk points for the current case). One note is that the coefficients of the Γ_5 basis function in Table 2 are arbitrary (subject to normalization). These are determined by a variational principle, i.e. one finds the set of coefficients that gives the maximum coupling constant.

In Table 3, the results of this calculation are given. The odd parity states have larger coupling constants since there are three terms contributing instead of the one term for the even parity case. This is of interest since the odd parity states only exist because of the presence of two f atoms in the primitive cell, which, as mentioned in the introduction, all heavy fermion superconductors have. The largest coupling constant occurs for a state of Γ_6^- symmetry. This state is an odd parity two dimensional group representation. It has point nodes along the c axis and a line of nodes in the $k_z = \pi/c$ zone face. It is interesting to note that although only the d_z component of the gap function vanishes on the $k_z = 0$ zone face as expected based on group theory arguments,¹⁷ all three d vector components vanish on the $k_z = \pi/c$ zone face, proving a counterexample to the argument in those papers that a line node gap function is not possible for odd parity states. Although the actual form of the gap function in the current case is extremely complicated since the $a_{\mu i}^{nk}$ are strong functions of momentum, this state (1) is from a two dimensional group representation and can thus explain the unusual phase diagram seen for UPt_3 , (2) has the correct nodal structure to explain various thermodynamic data of UPt_3 , and (3) is an odd parity state with the largest possible moment projection onto the basal plane for a two-dimensional group representation ($M_J = \pm 1$) which is necessary to explain the observed directional anisotropy of the upper critical field.¹⁸ It should be remarked, though, that the states Γ_1^- and Γ_4^- have coupling constants close to that of Γ_6^- and the ordering of the coupling constants will thus be sensitive to the cut-off of the energy shell used in the averaging in Eq. (2). The values tabulated in Table 3 should be multiplied by the quantity NV_4Z^2 to convert to an actual coupling constant, and as discussed above, the resulting coupling constant for Γ_6^- is of the right order to explain the observed value of T_c . Similar calculations have also been done for $J=2$ (3F) and $J=0$ (3P). For $J=2$, the largest coupling constant also has Γ_6^- symmetry (its value modulo V_2 is 0.85 of the $J=4$ one). For $J=0$, the largest coupling constant has Γ_1^+ (s-wave) symmetry. Its value modulo V_0 is a factor

of four larger than $J = 4$, so it is reassuring to find a repulsive V_0 over a wide range of Figure 1 (in the JJ coupling scheme, V_2 and V_0 are repulsive).

In conclusion, an orbital degenerate generalization of the 3He paramagnon model has been applied to f electrons and yields a superconducting pair state which satisfies Hunds rules ($L=5$, $S=1$, $J=4$). The degeneracy of this state is lifted by crystalline effects. Realistic calculations for the case of UPt_3 give a pair state with Γ_6^- symmetry which is consistent with experimental data with a reasonable estimate for T_c . The theory also explains the preference for heavy fermion superconductors to be uranium alloys, and also the role that the crystal structure (two formula units per unit cell) plays in the pairing.

This work was supported by U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Contract No. W-31-109-ENG-38. The author would like to acknowledge the hospitality of the Physics Dept., Uppsala University, where some of this work was completed, and to thank Kathryn Levin for many helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

1. P.W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. B* **30**, 1549 (1984).
2. M.R. Norman, *Physica C* **194**, 203 (1992) and references therein.
3. M.R. Norman, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 6315 (1993); *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 6121 (1991); *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 170 (1990).
4. P.W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 499 (1985).
5. That is, the energy E_0 determines the normal state Fermi energy since two f electrons are occupied per site (the effect of E_3 cannot be represented at the single particle level and is assumed to not enter into this determination).
6. R. Osborn, K.A. McEwen, E.A. Goremychkin, A.D. Taylor, *Physica B* **163**, 37 (1990).
7. P.W. Anderson and W.F. Brinkman, in *The Physics of Liquid and Solid Helium, Part II*, ed. K.H. Bennemann and J.B. Ketterson (J. Wiley, New York, 1978), p. 177.
8. Details of the vertex equations along with results obtained with a JJ coupling scheme will be presented in a longer paper.
9. Z.B. Goldschmidt, *Phys. Rev. A* **27**, 740 (1983).
10. χ_0 is actually a momentum dependent matrix in orbital space. Anisotropy in the real system will break the rotational invariance in the vertex equations, leading to an M dependent interaction. This complication will be treated in a longer paper.
11. Actually, the Coulomb repulsion (E_0) in cerium is about three times larger than in uranium, so the tendency towards pairing will be even further suppressed.
12. C.M. Varma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2723 (1985).

13. M.R. Norman, R.C. Albers, A.M. Boring, and N.E. Christensen, *Sol. State Comm.* **68**, 245 (1988).
14. One might wonder why such a large interaction would not lead to a high T_c for more itinerant systems with Z closer to one. The reason is that the effective interaction parameters used here are only appropriate for nearly localized f^2 systems. In palladium, for instance, the effective interaction is determined by the Stoner I , which leads to a very low estimate of T_c for triplet superconductivity.
15. J. Appel and P. Hertel, *Phys. Rev. B* **35**, 155 (1987).
16. P.W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. B* **30**, 4000 (1984); K. Ueda and T. M. Rice, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 7114 (1985).
17. G. E. Volovik and L. P. Gor'kov, *JETP* **61**, 843 (1985); E.I. Blount, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 2935 (1985).
18. C.H. Choi and J.A. Sauls, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 484 (1991).

Table 1. List of known heavy fermion superconductors with the number of formula units per unit cell. In parenthesis is the nature of the low temperature distorted phase in the single formula unit case (QP - quadrupolar, AF - antiferromagnetic, ? - not fully determined) and the resulting number of formula units.

Case	Formula Units
UPt_3	2
UBe_{13}	2
U_2PtC_2	2
URu_2Si_2	1 (QP/AF - 2)
UPd_2Al_3	1 (AF - 2)
UNi_2Al_3	1 (AF - 2)
$CeCu_2Si_2$	1 (? - 2 ?)

Table 2. Hexagonal basis functions for $J=4$. The forms listed in this table should be (a) antisymmetrized ($|\mu\rangle|\nu\rangle - |\nu\rangle|\mu\rangle$) and (b) symmetrized (+ representation) or antisymmetrized (- representation) with respect to site before use. For Γ_5 , α and β are variational coefficients such that the sum of their squares is equal to one, and this representation occurs twice (α, β and $\beta, -\alpha$). Note that both Γ_5 and Γ_6 are doublets obtained by replacing $|\mu\rangle$ by $|\mu\rangle$.

Rep	Basis Function
Γ_5	$\alpha 5/2\rangle 3/2\rangle + \beta(0.8018 5/2\rangle -1/2\rangle + 0.5976 3/2\rangle 1/2\rangle)$
Γ_3	$0.7071 5/2\rangle 1/2\rangle + 0.7071 -5/2\rangle -1/2\rangle$
Γ_4	$0.7071 5/2\rangle 1/2\rangle - 0.7071 -5/2\rangle -1/2\rangle$
Γ_6	$0.5345 5/2\rangle -3/2\rangle + 0.8452 3/2\rangle -1/2\rangle$
Γ_1	$0.2673(5/2\rangle -5/2\rangle + 3 3/2\rangle -3/2\rangle + 2 1/2\rangle -1/2\rangle)$

Table 3. Coupling constants for $J=4$ for UPt_3 . These are normalized to the coupling constant for the $J=0$, Γ_1^+ (s-wave) state and should be multiplied by this quantity (0.495, which is the square of the ratio of the $J=5/2$ f to the total density of states) and the quantity NV_4Z^2 to convert to real coupling constants. Even parity corresponds to + representation and odd parity to -.

Rep	even	odd
Γ_5	0.139	0.148
Γ_5	0.059	0.203
Γ_3	0.048	0.129
Γ_4	0.027	0.242
Γ_6	0.036	0.253
Γ_1	0.153	0.229

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1. Effective interaction (eV) for 3H , 3F , 3P , and 1I versus χ_0 for parameters appropriate to a U ion⁹ ($E_0 = 1225$ meV, $E_1 = 470.3$ meV, $E_2 = 1.923$ meV, $E_3 = 43.28$ meV). The zeros of energy for the f^1 and f^2 cases are marked by the dashed lines.